

On the classification of Stanley sequences

David Rolnick*

August 11, 2014

Abstract

An integer sequence is said to be *3-free* if no three elements form an arithmetic progression. Following the greedy algorithm, the *Stanley sequence* $S(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k)$ is defined to be the 3-free sequence $\{a_n\}$ having initial terms $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k$ and with each subsequent term $a_n > a_{n-1}$ chosen minimally such that the 3-free condition is not violated. Odlyzko and Stanley conjectured that Stanley sequences divide into two classes based on asymptotic growth patterns, with one class of highly structured sequences satisfying $a_n \approx \Theta(n^{\log_2 3})$ and another class of seemingly chaotic sequences obeying $a_n = \Theta(n^2 / \log n)$. We propose a rigorous definition of *regularity* in Stanley sequences based on local structure rather than asymptotic behavior and show that our definition implies the corresponding asymptotic property proposed by Odlyzko and Stanley. We then construct many classes of regular Stanley sequences, which include as special cases all such sequences previously identified. We show how two regular sequences may be combined into another regular sequence, and how parts of a Stanley sequence may be translated while preserving regularity. Finally, we demonstrate that certain Stanley sequences possess proper subsets that are also Stanley sequences, a situation that appears previously to have been assumed impossible.

1 Introduction

A set of non-negative integers is *3-free* if no three elements form an arithmetic progression. Given a 3-free set A with elements $a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_k$, we define the *Stanley sequence* $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ according to the greedy algorithm, as follows: Assuming a_n has been defined, let a_{n+1} be the smallest integer greater than a_n such that $\{a_0, \dots, a_{n+1}\}$ is 3-free. For convenience, we shall often write $S(a_0, a_2, \dots, a_k)$ for $S(\{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k\})$.

The simplest Stanley sequence is $S(0) = 0, 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 27, \dots$, the elements of which are exactly those integers with no 2's in their ternary representation. Odlyzko and Stanley [4] offered similar closed-form descriptions of the sequences $S(0, 3^n)$ and $S(0, 2 \cdot 3^n)$, for n any non-negative integer. Their work also suggested an overarching dichotomy among Stanley sequences, in which the more “structured” sequences (such as $S(0)$) followed one asymptotic growth pattern, while more “chaotic” sequences followed another.

Conjecture 1.1 (based on work by Odlyzko and Stanley [4]). *Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be a Stanley sequence. Then, for all n large enough, one of the following two patterns of growth is satisfied:*

1. $\frac{c}{2} \cdot n^{\log_2 3} \leq a_n \leq c \cdot n^{\log_2 3}$, or

*Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge MA. Email: drolnick@math.mit.edu

2. $a_n \approx c'n^2/\log n$.

Remark. The original paper [4] considered the first type of growth in the case of $c = 1$ only. However, if c is so restricted, the conjecture is certainly false, with $S(0, 1, 7)$ being one counterexample, requiring $c = 10/9$. (This assertion is simple to prove with machinery we will present in §2 and §3.)

We will call these two patterns of growth *Type 1* and *Type 2*. The closed-form descriptions given in [1] of $S(0, 3^n)$ and $S(0, 2 \cdot 3^n)$ demonstrate that these sequences do indeed follow Type 1 growth, but they are by no means the only such sequences. The justification given in [4] for conjecturing Type 2 growth is a non-constructive probabilistic method that suggests, but does not prove, that a “random” Stanley sequence should follow Type 2 growth. However, no particular sequence has yet been shown to be Type 2, though Lindhurst [2] has provided extensive data to support the notion that $S(0, 4)$ follows this type of growth.

Erdős et al. [1] posed several problems similar to Conjecture 1.1, regarding the density of Stanley sequences. Moy [3] recently solved one of these problems by showing that all Stanley sequences $\{a_n\}$ satisfy the asymptotic bound

$$a_n \leq x^2/(2 + \epsilon).$$

In this paper, we approach the conjectured dichotomy among Stanley sequences from the perspective of local structure, rather than asymptotic behavior. We begin, in Section 2, by identifying two important types of Stanley sequence.

Definition. We say that a Stanley sequence $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ is independent if there exists a constant λ , called the character, such that, for all sufficiently large k , the equations

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2^k+i} &= a_{2^k} + a_i \\ a_{2^k} &= 2a_{2^{k-1}} - \lambda + 1 \end{aligned}$$

hold whenever $0 \leq i < 2^k$. We say that an integer k_0 is adequate if (i) these equations are satisfied for all $k \geq k_0$ and (ii) k_0 is large enough that $a_{2^{k_0}}$ is not a necessary element of the set A .

Definition. We say that a Stanley sequence $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ is regular if there exist constants λ, σ and an independent Stanley sequence $\{a'_n\}$, having character λ , such that, for large enough k and $0 \leq i < 2^k$,

$$a_{2^k-\sigma+i} = a_{2^k-\sigma} + a'_i \quad a_{2^k-\sigma} = 2a_{2^{k-\sigma-1}} - \lambda + 1.$$

We refer to the sequence $\{a'_n\}$ as the core of $S(A)$ and the constant σ as the shift index.

Regularity is a strictly weaker condition than independence. We show that all regular Stanley sequences follow Type 1 growth, and we conjecture the converse.

In Section 3, we consider methods for constructing independent Stanley sequences. We begin by describing a class of independent Stanley sequences that includes as a special case the sequences $S(0, 3^n)$ and $S(0, 2 \cdot 3^n)$ detailed in [4].

Theorem 1.2 (see Example 3.1). Let k be a positive integer and $\mathcal{A}$ be a monotone decreasing family of subsets of $\{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$. Let

$$A = \{3^{a_1} + 3^{a_2} + \dots + 3^{a_n} \mid \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\} \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Then, $S(A \cup \{3^k\})$ and $S(A \cup \{2 \cdot 3^k\})$ are independent. (In Section 3, we give closed-form descriptions of these sequences.)

We next describe an operation that combines a regular with an independent sequence to yield a regular sequence.

Theorem 1.3 (see Example 3.3). *Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be independent and $S(B) = \{b_n\}$ be regular. Let k be adequate with respect to $S(A)$. Let $A^* = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2^k-1}\}$ and define*

$$A \otimes_k B = \{a_{2^k}b + a \mid a \in A^*, b \in B\}.$$

Then, $S(A \otimes_k B)$ is a regular Stanley sequence, independent if and only if B is, having description

$$S(A \otimes_k B) = \{a_{2^k}b + a \mid a \in A^*, b \in S(B)\},$$

with character $\lambda(A \otimes_k B) = a_{2^k} \cdot \lambda(B) + \lambda(A)$ and shift index $\sigma(A \otimes_k B) = 2^k \cdot \sigma(B)$.

Using this operation, we describe another class of independent Stanley sequences.

Theorem 1.4 (see Example 3.4). *Let k be a positive integer. Let T_1, T_2 be disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ such that no $t \in T_1$ satisfies $t - 1 \in T_2$. Let*

$$A = \left\{ (3^{a_1} + 3^{a_2} + \dots + 3^{a_m}) + 2 \left(3^{b_1} + 3^{b_2} + \dots + 3^{b_n} \right) \mid \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \subseteq T_1, \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \subseteq T_2 \right\}.$$

Then, $S(A)$ is an independent Stanley sequence.

In Section 4, we turn to dependent Stanley sequences. Given an independent sequence $S(A)$, one may obtain a dependent sequence by translating a portion of $S(A)$ and recomputing subsequent elements. The resulting sequence has $S(A)$ as its core.

Given the regular sequence $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ and the nonnegative integers k and c , let $S_k(c, A)$ be the Stanley sequence generated by the set

$$A_k(c, A) = \left\{ a_i \mid 0 \leq i < 2^k - \sigma(A) \right\} \cup \left\{ c + a_i \mid 2^k - \sigma(A) \leq i < 2^{k+1} - \sigma(A) \right\},$$

assuming that this set is 3-free (if it is not, then $S_k(c, A)$ is not defined).

Theorem 1.5 (see Example 4.2). *Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be an independent sequence with character λ . Let ℓ be the minimum adequate integer for $S(A)$, and pick $k \geq \ell$. Let c be such that*

$$\lambda \leq c \leq a_{2^k-2^\ell} - \lambda.$$

Then, $S_k(c, A)$ is defined and is a regular Stanley sequence, with core $S(A)$.

We conclude by noting that, for some regular sequences, an element may be removed without changing the Stanley sequence property of the other elements. (See Example 4.6.) This disproves the tacit assumption in Erdős et al. [1] and Moy [3] that Stanley sequences are *maximal* 3-free sets (3-free sets that cannot be strictly enlarged).

2 Regular Stanley sequences

We begin by introducing some useful terminology and notation. If $S(A)$ is a Stanley sequence, we say that A is a *nucleating set* of $S(A)$. Note that a given Stanley sequence has infinitely many nucleating sets, corresponding to all sufficiently large prefixes of the sequence. We define the *minimal* nucleating set of a Stanley sequence as the one which is of minimal cardinality.

We use the shorthand $A + n$ to denote the set $\{a + n \mid a \in A\}$, for any set A and integer n . It is easy to see that if $S(A)$ is a Stanley sequence and n is a non-negative integer, then

$$S(A + n) = S(A) + n.$$

In other words, translating the nucleating set translates the entire sequence. It is sufficient, therefore, when investigating Stanley sequences to consider only those which begin at 0. We say that such Stanley sequences are in *root position* and for the remainder of this paper will assume that all Stanley sequences under consideration are in root position.

We say an integer x is *covered* by a set S of integers if there exist $s, t \in S$ such that $s < t$ and $2t - s = x$. Then, the Stanley sequence $S(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k)$ is the unique increasing sequence $S = \{a_n\}$ where each integer $x > a_k$ is covered by S if and only if it is not in S . Given a Stanley sequence $S(A)$, we define the *omitted set* $O(A)$ to be the set of nonnegative integers that are neither in $S(A)$ nor are covered by $S(A)$. We let $\omega(A)$ denote the largest element of $O(A)$. It is immediate that $\omega(A)$ is less than the largest element of A .

We say that an integer x is *jointly covered* by sets S and T if there exist $s \in S, t \in T$ such that $s < t$ and $2t - s = x$. Thus, an integer jointly covered by S and S is covered by S . We say that a set X is covered (or jointly covered) by a set S (or pair of sets S and T) if every element of X is so covered.

The following lemma is trivial to prove but will be extremely useful hereafter.

Lemma 2.1 (Cover-shift Lemma). *If x is jointly covered by S and T , and if $n_1 \leq n_2$ are integers, then $x + (2n_2 - n_1)$ is jointly covered by $S + n_1$ and $T + n_2$.*

We are now ready to introduce the classes of Stanley sequence that are the subject of this paper.

2.1 Independent sequences

Definition. *We say that a Stanley sequence $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ is independent if there exists a constant λ such that, for all sufficiently large k , the equations*

$$a_{2^k+i} = a_{2^k} + a_i \tag{1}$$

$$a_{2^k} = 2a_{2^{k-1}} - \lambda + 1 \tag{2}$$

hold whenever $0 \leq i < 2^k$.

It is evident from this definition that the constant λ is unique. We may therefore refer to it as the *character* $\lambda(A)$ of the independent sequence $S(A)$.

For each k , we will refer to the set $\{a_i \mid 2^k \leq i < 2^{k+1}\}$ as the *kth block* Γ_k .

Example 2.2. *The Stanley sequence $S(0, 2, 5)$ is independent with character $\lambda = 4$.*

$$S(0, 2, 5) = 0, 2, \underbrace{5, 6}_{\Gamma_1}, \underbrace{9, 11, 14, 15}_{\Gamma_2}, \underbrace{27, 29, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42}_{\Gamma_3}, \dots$$

Note that, in moving from the last element of one block to the first element of the next block, the value of the sequence doubles and subtracts $(\lambda - 1)$. The next block is then a shift of the preceding terms. Thus, for instance,

$$2 \cdot a_3 - \lambda + 1 = 2 \cdot 6 - 4 + 1 = 9 = a_4$$

and $\{9, 11, 14, 15\} = \{0, 2, 5, 6\} + 9$. Likewise, $2 \cdot 15 - 4 + 1 = 27$, and $\{27, 29, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42\} = \{0, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 14, 15\} + 27$.

The following proposition shows that the criterion “for all sufficiently large k ” in the above definition can be replaced by “for a single sufficiently large k .”

Proposition 2.3. *Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be a Stanley sequence with $\omega = \omega(A)$, and suppose integers λ and k are such that $a_{2^k-1} \geq \lambda + \omega$ and that equations (1) and (2) hold whenever $0 \leq i < 2^k$. Then, $S(A)$ is independent with character λ .*

Proof. It suffices to show that (1) and (2) must hold for all $k' > k$, and hence to show that they hold if k is replaced with $k + 1$. Let $\Lambda = \{a_i \mid 0 \leq i < 2^k\}$ and $\Gamma = \{a_i \mid 2^k \leq i < 2^{k+1}\}$, so that $\Gamma = \Lambda + a_{2^k}$ (see Figure 1). Let B be the set of integers in the interval $[0, a_{2^k-1}]$ that are covered by Λ .

Our strategy will be to describe the integers covered by $\Lambda \cup \Gamma$ by breaking up this set into (i) the integers covered by Λ alone, (ii) the integers covered by Γ alone, (iii) the integers jointly covered by Λ and Γ . We additionally break up the set in (iii) into the sets $\{2y - x \mid x \in \Lambda, y \in \Gamma, y > x + a_{2^k}\}$, $\{2y - x \mid x \in \Lambda, y \in \Gamma, y = x + a_{2^k}\}$, and $\{2y - x \mid x \in \Lambda, y \in \Gamma, y < x + a_{2^k}\}$.

We begin by observing that Λ covers the following integers:

- B , by definition.
- The open interval (a_{2^k-1}, a_{2^k}) , since these integers are not in $S(A)$ and hence must be covered by $S(A)$.
- The set $O(A) + a_{2^k}$. To see this, observe that each element $s \in O(A) + a_{2^k}$ must be covered by $S(A)$, and yet cannot be covered by $\Lambda + a_{2^k} = B$ by the definition of $O(A)$. Hence, there must be $x \in \Lambda$ and $w \in S(A)$ such that $2w - x = s$. Since $x \leq a_{2^k-1}$ and $s \leq \omega + a_{2^k}$, we conclude that

$$2w \leq a_{2^k-1} + \omega + a_{2^k} \leq 2a_{2^k-1} - \lambda + 1 + a_{2^k}$$

(where the second inequality follows from $a_{2^k-1} \geq \lambda + \omega$). The right side of this equals $2a_{2^k}$, implying that $w < a_{2^k}$ and hence that $w \in \Lambda$. We conclude that s and hence $O(A) + a_{2^k}$ is covered by Λ .

It is easy to see that the union

$$B \cup (a_{2^k-1}, a_{2^k}) \cup (O(A) + a_{2^k})$$

of these three sets in fact constitutes *exactly* the integers covered by Λ . Hence, by the Cover-shift Lemma (Lemma 2.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
S(0, 2, 5) &= 0, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 14, 15, 27, 29, 32, 33, 36, 38, 41, 42, 81, \dots \\
\lambda &= 4 \\
O(A) &= \{1, 3, 4\} \\
\Lambda &= \{a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3\} = \{0, 2, 5, 6\} \\
\Gamma &= \Lambda + a_4 = \{9, 11, 14, 15\}
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 1: The independent Stanley sequence $\{0, 2, 5\}$, with character $\lambda = 4$.

- The set $\Gamma = \Lambda + a_{2^k}$ must cover exactly the union

$$(B + a_{2^k}) \cup (a_{2^{k+1}-1}, 2a_{2^k}) \cup (O(A) + 2a_{2^k}).$$

- The set $\{2y - x \mid x \in \Lambda, y \in \Gamma, y > x + a_{2^k}\}$ equals the union

$$(B + 2a_{2^k}) \cup (a_{2^k-1} + 2a_{2^k}, 3a_{2^k}) \cup (O(A) + 3a_{2^k}).$$

We now note that

$$\{2y - x \mid x \in \Lambda, y \in \Gamma, y = x + a_{2^k}\} = \Lambda + 2a_{2^k}.$$

Letting

$$C = \{2y - x \mid x \in \Lambda, y \in \Gamma, y < x + a_{2^k}\},$$

we see that all elements of C are less than

$$2a_{2^{k+1}-1} - a_{2^k-1} = 2a_{2^k} + a_{2^k-1} < 3a_{2^k}.$$

Hence, $C \subseteq [0, 3a_{2^k})$.

Summing up our results, we find that the integers covered by $\Lambda \cup \Gamma$ are exactly the union

$$\begin{aligned}
&B \cup (a_{2^k-1}, a_{2^k}) \cup (O(A) + a_{2^k}) \cup (B + a_{2^k}) \cup (a_{2^{k+1}-1}, 2a_{2^k}) \cup (O(A) + 2a_{2^k}) \\
&\cup (B + 2a_{2^k}) \cup (a_{2^k-1} + 2a_{2^k}, 3a_{2^k}) \cup (O(A) + 3a_{2^k}) \cup (\Lambda + 2a_{2^k}) \cup C.
\end{aligned}$$

Restricting to integers greater than $a_{2^{k+1}-1}$, we obtain the set

$$\begin{aligned}
&(a_{2^{k+1}-1}, 2a_{2^k}) \cup (O(A) + 2a_{2^k}) \cup (B + 2a_{2^k}) \cup (a_{2^k-1} + 2a_{2^k}, 3a_{2^k}) \\
&\cup (O(A) + 3a_{2^k}) \cup (\Lambda + 2a_{2^k}) \cup (C \cap (a_{2^{k+1}-1}, \infty)).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the union $(O(A) + 2a_{2^k}) \cup (B + 2a_{2^k}) \cup (\Lambda + 2a_{2^k})$ comprises the entire interval $[2a_{2^k}, a_{2^k-1} + 2a_{2^k}]$, the preceding expression simplifies to

$$(a_{2^{k+1}-1}, 3a_{2^k}) \cup (O(A) + 3a_{2^k}) \cup (C \cap (a_{2^{k+1}-1}, \infty)).$$

Because C is a subset of $[0, 3a_{2^k})$, the last term is already included in the first, giving

$$(a_{2^{k+1}-1}, 3a_{2^k}) \cup (O(A) + 3a_{2^k}).$$

This shows that

$$a_{2^{k+1}} = 3a_{2^k} = 2a_{2^k} + 2a_{2^k-1} - \lambda + 1 = 2a_{2^{k+1}-1} - \lambda + 1$$

and more generally that the terms of $S(A)$ that follow $a_{2^{k+1}-1}$ are exactly the elements of the set $A + 3a_{2^k}$, followed by as many terms of $S(A) + 3a_{2^k}$ as occur before $2a_{2^{k+1}} - a_0 = 6a_{2^k}$. Since the elements of $S(A) + 3a_{2^k}$ that occur before $6a_{2^k}$ are exactly the elements

$$a_0 + 3a_{2^k}, a_1 + 3a_{2^k}, \dots, a_{2^{k+1}-1} + 3a_{2^k},$$

we conclude that equations (1) and (2) hold with $k+1$ substituted for k . Hence, these equations must hold for all $k' > k$ and $S(A)$ is independent. $\square$

Proposition 2.4. *Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be an independent sequence. Then, there exists a constant α such that, for k large enough,*

$$a_{2^k} = \alpha \cdot 3^k.$$

Proof. For sufficiently large k ,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2^{k+1}} &= 2(a_{2^k} + a_{2^k-1}) - \lambda + 1 \\ &= 2\left(a_{2^k} + \frac{1}{2}(a_{2^k} + \lambda)\right) - \lambda + 1 \\ &= 3a_{2^k}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. $\square$

2.2 Regular sequences

Having now defined the independent Stanley sequences, we can define the more general class of well-structured Stanley sequences to which they belong.

Definition. *We say that a Stanley sequence $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ is regular if there exist constants λ, σ and an independent Stanley sequence $\{a'_n\}$ such that*

- *The character of $\{a'_n\}$ equals λ .*
- *For large enough k , the equations*

$$a_{2^k-\sigma+i} = a_{2^k-\sigma} + a'_i \tag{3}$$

$$a_{2^k-\sigma} = 2a_{2^k-\sigma-1} - \lambda + 1 \tag{4}$$

hold whenever $0 \leq i < 2^k$.

A Stanley sequence that is not regular will be called irregular.

Example 2.5. The sequence $\{a_n\} = S(0, 1, 4)$ is regular with $\lambda = 0$ and $\{a'_n\} = S(0)$. As with most regular sequences we will consider, $\sigma = 0$.

As with independent sequences, we can break up the sequence into blocks Γ_k as follows, where the length of each block is a power of 2:

$$\begin{aligned}\{a_n\} &= 0, 1, \underbrace{4, 5}_{\Gamma_1}, \underbrace{11, 12, 14, 15}_{\Gamma_2}, \underbrace{31, 32, 34, 35, 40, 41, 43, 44}_{\Gamma_3}, \dots \\ \{a'_n\} &= 0, 1, \underbrace{3, 4}_{\Gamma_1}, \underbrace{9, 10, 12, 13}_{\Gamma_2}, \underbrace{27, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, 39, 40}_{\Gamma_3}, \dots\end{aligned}$$

Note that, in moving from the last element of one block to the first element of the next block, the value of the sequence doubles and subtracts $(\lambda - 1)$. The next block is then a shift of the corresponding preceding terms in the sequence $\{a'_n\}$. Note that

$$2 \cdot a_3 - \lambda + 1 = 2 \cdot 5 - 0 + 1 = 11 = a_4$$

and $\{11, 12, 14, 15\} = \{0, 1, 3, 4\} + 11$. Likewise, $2 \cdot 15 + 1 = 31$ and $\{31, 32, 34, 35, 40, 41, 43, 44\} = \{0, 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13\} + 31$.

Proposition 2.6. If $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ is regular, then there is a unique choice of constants λ, σ and independent Stanley sequence $\{a'_n\}$ such that the above definition of regularity is satisfied.

Proof. Observe that uniqueness of σ implies uniqueness of λ and $\{a'_n\}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that σ can take on distinct values $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2$ (for corresponding distinct pairs $(\lambda, \{a'_n\})$). Then, for large enough k ,

$$a_{2^{k+1}-\sigma_2-1} > a_{2^{k+1}-\sigma_1} \approx 2a_{2^{k+1}-\sigma_1-1} > 2a_{2^k-\sigma_2},$$

implying that, for each choice of $\{a'_n\}$,

$$a'_{2^k} = a_{2^{k+1}-\sigma_2-1} - a_{2^k-\sigma_2} > a_{2^k-\sigma_2}.$$

Since $a_{2^k} = \alpha \cdot 3^k$, we know that $\log a_{2^k-\sigma_2}$ must be asymptotically no more than 3. However,

$$a_{2^{k+1}-\sigma_2} \approx 2a_{2^{k+1}-\sigma_2-1} > 3a_{2^k-\sigma_2},$$

implying that $\log a_{2^k-\sigma_2}$ is strictly greater than 3, a contradiction. Hence, σ is unique, implying the proposition. $\square$

For $S(A)$ regular, we write λ, σ , and $\{a'_n\}$ as $\lambda(A), \sigma(A)$, and $S'(A)$, respectively and refer to them as the *character*, *shift index*, and *core* of the Stanley sequence $S(A)$. We say that an integer k_0 is *adequate* if (i) all $k \geq k_0$ satisfy equations (3) and (4), and (ii) k_0 is large enough that $a_{2^{k_0}-\sigma(A)}$ is not contained in the minimal nucleating set of $S(A)$.

It is evident that the independent Stanley sequences $S(A)$ are exactly the regular Stanley sequences that satisfy $\sigma(A) = 0$ and $S'(A) = S(A)$. We say that a sequence is *dependent* if it is regular but not independent.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be a regular sequence, and let α be the constant implied in Proposition 2.4 such that $a'_{2^k} = \alpha \cdot 3^k$ for large k . Then, there exists a constant β such that, for k large enough,*

$$a_{2^k - \sigma(A)} = \alpha \cdot 3^k + \beta \cdot 2^k.$$

Proof. Let $\lambda = \lambda(A)$, $\sigma = \sigma(A)$, and $\{a'_n\} = S'(A)$. Pick some adequate k . Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2^{k+1} - \sigma} - 2a_{2^k - \sigma} &= (2a_{2^{k+1} - \sigma - 1} - \lambda + 1) - 2a_{2^k - \sigma} \\ &= 2(a_{2^{k+1} - \sigma - 1} - a_{2^k - \sigma}) - \lambda + 1 \\ &= 2a'_{2^k - \sigma - 1} - \lambda + 1 \\ &= a'_{2^k - \sigma} \\ &= \alpha \cdot 3^k, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the proposition. □

This proposition allows us to define the functions $\alpha(A)$ and $\beta(A)$ for each A such that $S(A)$ is regular. Note that while $\alpha(A)$ and $\beta(A)$ must evidently be rational, they need not be integers, as in the case of $A = \{0, 1, 7\}$, where $\alpha(A) = 10/9$. It is clear that $\alpha(A)$ must be positive; a similar condition on $\beta(A)$ appears true from data.

Conjecture 2.8. $\beta(A) \geq 0$ for all regular Stanley sequences $S(A)$.

As a corollary to Proposition 2.7, we obtain the following welcome result.

Corollary 2.9. *All regular Stanley sequences follow Type 1 growth.*

Indeed, our investigation of Stanley sequences suggests that the dichotomy between regular and irregular sequences corresponds precisely with the dichotomy hypothesized in [4] between Type 1- and Type 2-growth sequences.

Conjecture 2.10. *All irregular Stanley sequences follow Type 2 growth.*

We also mention a useful property which appears to hold for all regular sequences.

Definition. *Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ and $S(A') = \{a'_n\}$ be Stanley sequences. We say that $S(A)$ is faithful to $S(A')$ if, for each $a'_n < \omega(A')$ there exists some m for which $a_m = a'_n$.*

Conjecture 2.11. *Every regular sequence is faithful to its core.*

2.3 The character

We conclude this section with a consideration of the range of the character function.

Proposition 2.12. *Let $S(A)$ be a regular Stanley sequence. Then $\lambda(A) \geq 0$, with $\lambda \neq 1, 3$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda(A) = \lambda$. We may assume without loss of generality that $S(A)$ is independent, since the core of $S(A)$ has the same character as $S(A)$ itself. Then, consider some adequate k , so that

$$a_{2^k} = 2a_{2^{k-1}} - \lambda + 1$$

holds. We note that since $a_{2^k} - 1 = 2a_{2^{k-1}} - \lambda$ is not in $S(A)$, it must be covered by the set $T = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2^{k-1}}\}$ and hence can be at most $2a_{2^{k-1}}$. We conclude that $\lambda \geq 0$. Further, we note that since $2a_{2^{k-1}}$ is certainly covered by T , the character λ cannot be 1.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\lambda = 3$. If $1 \in S(A)$, then $a_{2^{k+1}} = a_{2^k} + a_1 = a_{2^k} + 1$ by regularity. Because $a_{2^k} = 2a_{2^{k-1}} - 2$, we conclude that

$$a_{2^{k+1}} = 2a_{2^{k-1}} - 1,$$

which is a contradiction since then $1, a_{2^{k-1}}, a_{2^{k+1}}$ form an arithmetic progression. We conclude that $1 \notin S(A)$, which means that $2a_{2^{k-1}} - 1$ must be covered by T . Suppose $2t - s = 2a_{2^{k-1}} - 1$ for $s, t \in T$. Since the greatest element of T is $a_{2^{k-1}}$, we must have $t = a_{2^{k-1}}$, because smaller t would force s to be negative. But then $s = 1$, which is a contradiction, since we know $1 \notin S(A)$. We conclude that $\lambda \neq 3$. $\square$

For further investigation of forbidden character values, the following lemma is useful.

Lemma 2.13. *If $S(A)$ is independent, then $\omega(A) < \lambda(A)$.*

Proof. Take some extremely large integer k and let $T = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2^{k-1}}\}$. Let $x = \omega(A) + a_{2^k}$. We know x is covered by $S(A)$, so let $s, t \in S(A)$ be such that $s < t$ and $2t - s = x$. If neither s nor t is in T , then $s' = s - a_{2^k}$ and $t' = t - a_{2^k}$ must be in $S(A)$ and must satisfy $2t' - s' = x - a_{2^k}$. Since $x - a_{2^k} \in O(A)$ and thus cannot be covered by $S(A)$, this is impossible, so at least one of s, t must be in T . If only s is in T , then

$$2t - s \geq 2a_{2^k} - a_{2^{k-1}} = a_{2^k} + a_{2^{k-1}} - \lambda(A) + 1,$$

which is larger than x because k is large. Hence, both s, t must be in T . Since the maximum integer covered by T is $2a_{2^{k-1}} = a_{2^k} + \lambda(A) - 1$, the lemma follows. $\square$

Corollary 2.14. *At most finitely many independent Stanley sequences exist with a given character λ .*

Proof. Suppose $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ is independent with $\lambda = \lambda(A)$ and $\omega = \omega(A)$, such that $A = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ is the minimal nucleating set for the sequence. Since A is minimal, $\omega > a_{m-1}$. Also, we must have $\omega = a_m - 1$ unless $a_m - 1$ is itself covered by A , which can only occur if $a_m - 1 \leq 2a_{m-1}$. Since a_{m-1} is bounded above by ω , this implies that a_m is bounded above by $2\omega + 1$.

Now, the preceding lemma tells us that $\omega < \lambda$. Hence, $a_m \leq 2\lambda - 1$, implying the desired result. $\square$

This corollary tells us that whether or not a given character is possible for an independent (and hence regular) $S(A)$ can be ascertained by checking a finite number of potential nucleating sets A . We have examined (by computer) these possible nucleating sets for many character values; our data suggest that 1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 15 are impossible for the character function. (However, this result is

not certain since it assumed the irregularity of various Stanley sequences, while as yet no Stanley sequence has been shown definitively to be irregular.) For all other characters up to 76, we have found corresponding regular sequences. (See the appendix for sample data.) A method we will outline in the next section suggests that all sufficiently large values are possible for the character function. We therefore offer the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2.15. *The range of the character function is exactly the set of integers n that are at least 0 and are not in the set $\{1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 15\}$.*

We may also obtain another corollary to the preceding lemma.

Corollary 2.16. *Every regular sequence of character 0 has $S(0)$ as its core.*

Proof. If $S(A)$ is an independent sequence with character 0, then $\omega(A) < 0$ by the lemma, implying that $\omega(A)$ is not defined and so $O(A)$ is empty. Hence, $S(A) = S(0)$ and the result follows. $\square$

3 Constructing independent sequences

Heretofore, the only sequences shown to follow Type 1 growth have been the sequences $S(0, 3^k)$ and $S(0, 2 \cdot 3^k)$, for which complete descriptions were given in [4]. It is easily checked that these sequences are independent for any k . In this section we offer several novel methods for constructing independent sequences, while in the next section we construct dependent sequences. The classes of sequences we describe include $S(0, 3^k)$ and $S(0, 2 \cdot 3^k)$ as special cases.

For convenience in stating certain results, we define the functions t_i on nonnegative integers x by letting $t_i(x)$ equal the digit in the 3^i 's place in the ternary representation of x . Recall Theorem 1.2, which we restate here.

Theorem 1.2. *Let k be a positive integer and $\mathcal{A}$ be a monotone decreasing family of subsets of $\{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$ (i.e., every set in $\mathcal{A}$ has all its subsets contained in $\mathcal{A}$). Let*

$$A = \{3^{a_1} + 3^{a_2} + \dots + 3^{a_n} \mid \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\} \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Then, $S(A \cup \{3^k\})$ and $S(A \cup \{2 \cdot 3^k\})$ are independent Stanley sequences.

In particular, these sequences admit the following closed-form descriptions:

1. $S(A \cup \{3^k\})$ contains exactly those integers $x \geq 0$ such that
 - $t_i(x) = 0$ or 1 for $i \neq k$.
 - If $t_k(x) = 0$, then $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i(x)3^i \in A$.
 - If $t_k(x) = 2$, then $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i(x)3^i \notin A$.
2. $S(A \cup \{2 \cdot 3^k\})$ contains exactly those integers $x \geq 0$ such that
 - $t_i(x) = 0$ or 1 for $i \neq k, k+1$.
 - $t_k(x) = 0$ or 2.
 - If $t_k(x) = t_{k+1}(x) = 0$, then $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i(x)3^i \in A$.
 - If $t_{k+1}(x) = 2$, then $t_k(x) = 0$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} t_i(x)3^i \notin A$.

Example 3.1. Take $k = 3$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{\emptyset, \{0\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{0, 2\}\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \{0, 1, 10, 100, 101\} \text{ in base 3} \\ &= \{0, 1, 3, 9, 10\} \text{ in base 10.} \end{aligned}$$

The theorem implies that $S(0, 1, 3, 9, 10, 27)$ and $S(0, 1, 3, 9, 10, 54)$ are independent. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} S(0, 1, 9, 10, 27) &= 0, 1, 10, 100, 101, 1000, 1001, 1010, 1011, 1100, 1101, 1110, 1111, 2011, 2110, \\ &\quad 2111, 10000, 10001, 10010, 10100, 10101, 11000, 11001, 11010, 11011, 11100, \\ &\quad 11101, 11110, 11111, 12011, 12110, 12111, 100000, \dots \text{ in base 3} \\ &= 0, 1, 3, 9, 10, 27, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, 39, 40, 58, 66, 67, \\ &\quad \underbrace{81, 82, 84, 90, 91, 108, 109, 111, 112, 117, 118, 120, 121, 139, 147, 148,}_{\Gamma_4} \\ &\quad 243, \dots \text{ in base 10} \end{aligned}$$

is independent with character $\lambda = 54$ satisfying $2 \cdot 67 - \lambda + 1 = 81$ and $2 \cdot 148 - \lambda + 1 = 243$.

Proof. We will prove the theorem for $S(A \cup \{3^k\})$ (the proof for $S(A \cup \{2 \cdot 3^k\})$ is very similar). Pick some k and $\mathcal{A}$ according to the theorem statement, let A be defined from $\mathcal{A}$ as in the theorem, and let S be the sequence consisting of those nonnegative integers x which satisfy the three desired conditions on ternary digits. We must prove that $S = S(A \cup \{3^k\})$, for which we need (i) that S is 3-free, and (ii) that $x > 3^k$ is covered by S if $x \notin S$.

We first prove (i). Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exist $x, y, z \in S$ with $y, z < x$ such that $2y - z = x$. Since the ternary digits t_0 through t_{k-1} must be either 0 or 1 in x, y, z , we can conclude that these digits are all the same for x, y, z . Now, if $t_k(x), t_k(y), t_k(z)$ are not to be identical, they must take on all values 0, 1, 2 in some order. However, if t_k is 0, the previous ternary digits must form an element of A , whereas if t_k is 2, the previous ternary digits cannot form an element of A . Since we know that $t_i(x) = t_i(y) = t_i(z)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, we conclude that t_k is identical for x, y, z . Now, since t_i must be 0 or 1 for $i > k$, every such digit must also be identical for x, y, z , implying $x = y = z$, a contradiction. We conclude that S must be 3-free.

We now prove (ii). Suppose that $x > 3^k$ with $x \notin S$. We construct $y, z \in S$ digit-wise so that $y, z < x$ and $x = 2y - z$. For each $i < k$, we set

- $t_i(y) = t_i(z) = 0$ if $t_i(x) = 0$.
- $t_i(y) = t_i(z) = 1$ if $t_i(x) = 1$.
- $t_i(y) = 1$ and $t_i(z) = 0$ if $t_i(x) = 2$.

Before assigning the remaining digits $t_i(y)$ and $t_i(z)$, we define the numbers y_0 and z_0 to be the ternary subwords of y and z , respectively, formed by considering only digits 0 through $k-1$. We note that the nonzero digits of z_0 are a subset of those of y_0 . Hence, if y_0 is in A then z_0 is also, since $\mathcal{A}$ is monotone decreasing.

This observation made, we now proceed to define the remaining digits.

Case 3.1.1. $t_k(x) \neq 0$.

We begin by assigning $t_i(y)$ and $t_i(z)$ for $i > k$ following the same rules as for $i < k$. Next, we define $t_k(y)$ and $t_k(z)$, as follows.

If $t_k(x) = 1$, we set $t_k(y) = t_k(z) = 1$. By the definition of S , the y and z thus constructed will be in S , showing x is covered by S . If $t_k(x) = 2$ and $z_0 \in A$, then we set $t_k(z) = 0$ and $t_k(y) = 1$. Again $y, z \in S$, so x is covered by S . On the other hand, if $t_k(x) = 0$ and $z_0 \notin A$, then we may conclude $y_0 \notin A$. We here set $t_k(y) = t_k(z) = 2$, and conclude again that $y, z \in S$.

Case 3.1.2. $t_k(x) = 0$ and $y_0 \in A$.

We begin by assigning $t_i(y)$ and $t_i(z)$ for $i > k$ following the same rules as for $i < k$. Next, we set $t_k(y) = t_k(z) = 0$. Since y_0 is in A , z_0 must be as well, so $y, z \in S$, as desired.

Case 3.1.3. $t_k(x) = 0$ and $y_0 \notin A$

We begin by assigning $t_i(y)$ and $t_i(z)$ for $i > k$ following the same rules as for $i < k$, except with $t_i(x)$ replaced by $t_i(x - 3^{k+1})$ throughout. (Since $x > 3^k$ and $t_k(x) = 0$, we know that $x - 3^{k+1}$ is a nonnegative integer.) Next, we set $t_k(y) = 2$ and $t_k(z) = 1$. It is simple to verify that $y, z \in S$.

We conclude that in all cases $y, z \in S$ and hence all $x \notin S$ satisfying $x > 3^k$ are covered by S . Hence, $S = S(A \cup \{3^k\})$, as desired. That $S(A \cup \{3^k\})$ is independent follows routinely from the definition of S . $\square$

Remark. The characters of $S(A \cup \{3^k\})$ and $S(A \cup \{2 \cdot 3^k\})$ can easily be shown to equal $2 \cdot 3^k$ and $4 \cdot 3^k$, respectively, provided that A does not contain all subsets of $\{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$. If A does contain all subsets of $\{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, then the sequence $S(A \cup \{2 \cdot 3^k\})$ has character $2 \cdot 3^k$, whereas $S(A \cup \{3^k\})$ is simply $S(0)$ and has character 0 for any k .

We can also develop the preceding theorem in a different way. Given an independent sequence $S(A) = \{a_n\}$, define the k -reversal $R_k(A)$ of $S(A)$ as follows: For $x = a_{2^k-1}$, set

$$R_k(A) = S(x - a_{2^k-1}, x - a_{2^k-2}, \dots, x - a_1, x - a_0).$$

Note that this nucleating set is indeed 3-free and starts with 0. We say that an independent sequence is *reversible* if for every adequate k , the k -reversal of the sequence is independent.

Proposition 3.2. As defined in the preceding theorem, the sets $A \cup \{3^k\}$ and $A \cup \{2 \cdot 3^k\}$ are reversible.

We omit the proof of this result, since it is routine and not especially instructive.

Theorem 1.3 offers a more interesting way of generating new regular Stanley sequences from existing ones.

Theorem 1.3. Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be independent and $S(B) = \{b_n\}$ be regular. Let k be adequate with respect to A . Let $A^* = \{a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2^k-1}\}$ and define

$$A \otimes_k B = \{a_{2^k}b + a \mid a \in A^*, b \in B\}.$$

Then, $S(A \otimes_k B)$ is a regular Stanley sequence, independent if and only if B is, having description

$$S(A \otimes_k B) = \{a_{2^k}b + a \mid a \in A^*, b \in S(B)\},$$

with character $\lambda(A \otimes_k B) = a_{2^k} \cdot \lambda(B) + \lambda(A)$ and shift index $\sigma(A \otimes_k B) = 2^k \cdot \sigma(B)$.

Example 3.3. Take $A = \{0\}$ and $B = \{0, 2, 5\}$. Then, $a_2 = 3$ and

$$\begin{aligned} A \otimes_2 B &= \{3 \cdot b + a \mid a \in \{0, 1\}, b \in \{0, 2, 5\}\} \\ &= \{0, 1, 6, 7, 15, 16\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the sequence

$$\begin{aligned} S(0, 1, 6, 7, 15, 16) &= 0, 1, 6, 7, 15, 16, 18, 19, \underbrace{27, 28, 33, 34, 42, 43, 45, 46}_{\Gamma_3}, \\ &\quad \underbrace{81, 82, 87, 88, 96, 97, 99, 100, 108, 109, 114, 115, 123, 124, 126, 127}_{\Gamma_4}, \\ &\quad 243, \dots \end{aligned}$$

is independent with character $3\lambda(B) + \lambda(A) = 3 \cdot 4 + 0 = 12$.

Proof. Let $S = \{a_{2^k}b + a \mid a \in A^*, b \in S(B)\}$ be the proposed form of the sequence $S(A \otimes_k B)$, and let x_0 be the largest element of $A \otimes_k B$. It suffices to show (i) that S is 3-free, and (ii) that every integer $x > x_0$ not in S is covered by S .

We first prove that S is 3-free. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $x, y, z \in S$ exist with $y, z < x$ and $2y - z = x$. Since no three distinct elements of A^* form an arithmetic progression modulo a_{2^k} , we conclude that x, y, z must all be identical modulo a_{2^k} to some common a_i . But then the elements $(x - a_i)/a_{2^k}, (y - a_i)/a_{2^k}, (z - a_i)/a_{2^k}$ of $S(B)$ must form an arithmetic progression - a contradiction. Hence, S must be 3-free.

Now suppose that $x > x_0$ is not in S . We must show it is covered by S . Let m, r be such that $x = m \cdot a_{2^k} + r$. There are two possibilities:

Case 3.3.1. r is in A^* or is covered by it.

Pick $a_i, a_j \in A^*$ such that $2a_i - a_j = r$. Since $x > x_0$, m must either be in $S(B)$ or else be covered by it. Picking b_g, b_h such that $2b_g - b_h = m$, we see that

$$x = 2(a_{2^k}b_g + a_i) - (a_{2^k}b_h + a_j).$$

Case 3.3.2. $r \in O(A)$.

In this case, there exist $a_i, a_j \in A^*$ such that $2a_i - a_j = a_{2^k} + r$. Then, either $m - 1$ is in $S(B)$ or covered by it. Picking b_g, b_h such that $2b_g - b_h = m - 1$, we see that

$$x = 2(a_{2^k}b_g + a_i) - (a_{2^k}b_h + a_j).$$

We conclude that, in both possible cases, x is covered by S and hence that S is indeed $S(A \otimes_k B)$. That $S(A \otimes_k B)$ is regular, with character and shift index as stated, follows routinely from the explicit description of S . $\square$

Remark. Theorem 1.3 proves that a great number of integers are attainable as characters of regular Stanley sequences. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\{0\} \otimes_1 A) &= 3\lambda(A) \\ \lambda(\{0, 2\} \otimes_1 A) &= 3\lambda(A) + 2 \end{aligned}$$

It appears possible that similar reasoning could show the attainability of all character values above a certain constant; more research in this area is called for.

We will refer to the operation $A \otimes_k B$ just described as the k -product of A and B . We note that k -multiplication of independent sequences is associative; this follows immediately from our closed-form description of the terms of $A \otimes_k B$.

Theorem 1.3 allows for the construction of many new regular Stanley sequences, such as those described in Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 1.4. *Let k be a positive integer. Let T_1, T_2 be disjoint subsets of $\{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ such that no $t \in T_1$ satisfies $t - 1 \in T_2$. Let*

$$A = \left\{ (3^{a_1} + 3^{a_2} + \dots + 3^{a_m}) + 2 \left(3^{b_1} + 3^{b_2} + \dots + 3^{b_n} \right) \mid \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \subseteq T_1, \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \subseteq T_2 \right\}.$$

Then, $S(A)$ is an independent Stanley sequence.

Example 3.4. *Let $k = 3$, let $T_1 = \{0, 3\}$ and $T_2 = \{1\}$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \{0, 1, 20, 21, 1000, 1001, 1020, 1021\} \text{ in base } 3 \\ &= \{0, 1, 6, 7, 27, 28, 33, 34\} \text{ in base } 10. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the sequence

$$\begin{aligned} S(A) &= 0, 1, 20, 21, 1000, 1001, 1020, 1021, 1100, 1101, 1120, 1121, 2100, 2101, 2120, 2121, \\ &\quad 10000, 10001, 10020, 10021, 11000, 11001, 11020, 11021, 11100, 11101, 11120, 11121, \\ &\quad 12100, 12101, 12120, 12121, \\ &\quad 100000, \dots \text{ in base } 3 \\ &= 0, 1, 6, 7, 27, 28, 33, 34, 36, 37, 42, 43, 63, 64, 69, 70, \\ &\quad \boxed{81, 82, 87, 88, 108, 109, 114, 115, 117, 118, 123, 124, 144, 145, 150, 151,} \\ &\quad \underbrace{\hspace{15em}}_{\Gamma_4} \\ &\quad 243, \dots \text{ in base } 10 \end{aligned}$$

is independent with character $\lambda = 60$.

Before proving Theorem 1.4, we shall present two weaker versions of this theorem. Their proofs follow routine case analysis and are omitted.

Lemma 3.5. *Let k be a positive integer, and j an integer such that $0 \leq j \leq k$. Set*

$$B_1 = \{3^{b_1} + 3^{b_2} + \dots + 3^{b_m} \mid j \leq b_1 < b_2 < \dots < b_m \leq k\}.$$

Then, $S(B_1)$ is independent, with $k + 1$ adequate. Specifically, $S(B_1)$ consists of all integers $x \geq 0$ satisfying

- $t_i(x)$ equals 0 or 1 for all i not in the interval $[j, k]$.
- If $t_j(x), t_{j+1}(x), \dots, t_k(x)$ are all 0 or 1, but are not all 1, then $t_i = 0$ for all $i < j$.
- If $t_j(x), t_{j+1}(x), \dots, t_k(x)$ are not all either 0 or 1, then (i) not all $t_i(x)$ are 0 for $i < j$, and (ii) $t_i(x)$ equals 1 or 2 for $j \leq i \leq k$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let k be a positive integer, and j an integer such that $0 \leq j \leq k$. Set*

$$B_2 = \{2 \left(3^{b_1} + 3^{b_2} + \dots + 3^{b_m} \right) \mid j \leq b_1 < b_2 < \dots < b_m \leq k\}.$$

Then, $S(B_2)$ is independent, with $k+2$ adequate.

To describe the elements of B_2 in closed form, we first define a function ζ on the set of non-negative integers x such that $t_i(x)$ equals 0 or 2 for all $j \leq i \leq k$. Set $\zeta(x)$ equal to

- *x itself, if $t_i(x) = 0$ for all $i < j$*
- *otherwise, the integer obtained from x by switching to 1 all digits $t_i(x) = 2$ such that $j \leq i \leq k$ and at least one of $t_j(x), t_{j+1}(x), \dots, t_{i-1}(x)$ is zero.*

Then, $S(B_2)$ consists of all integers $\zeta(x)$ such that x satisfies

- *$t_i(x)$ equals 0 or 2 for all i in the interval $[j, k+1]$.*
- *$t_i(x)$ equals 0 or 1 for all i not in the interval $[j, k+1]$.*
- *If $t_j(x), t_{j+1}(x), \dots, t_k(x)$ are all 0 or 2, but are not all 2, then $t_i = 0$ for all $i < j$.*
- *If $t_{k+1} = 0$, then $t_j(x), t_{j+1}(x), \dots, t_k(x)$ are all 0 or 2.*
- *If $t_{k+1} = 2$, then $x' \notin S$, where x' is obtained from x by switching t_{k+1} to 0.*

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We observe that A can be expressed as the product

$$A_1 \otimes_{k_1} A_2 \otimes_{k_2} \dots \otimes_{k_{m-1}} A_m,$$

where each A_i is either of the form B_1 (see Lemma 3.5) or of the form B_2 (see Lemma 3.6), with each k_i a corresponding adequate integer to A_i . Then, applying Theorem 1.3 finishes the proof. $\square$

4 Constructing dependent sequences

In this section we will demonstrate two methods for constructing dependent sequences from existing regular sequences.

4.1 Shifted Stanley sequences

Given the regular sequence $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ and the nonnegative integers k and c , let the k -shifted Stanley sequence $S_k(c, A)$ be the Stanley sequence generated by the set

$$A_k(c, A) = \left\{ a_i \mid 0 \leq i < 2^k - \sigma(A) \right\} \cup \left\{ c + a_i \mid 2^k - \sigma(A) \leq i < 2^{k+1} - \sigma(A) \right\},$$

assuming that this set is 3-free (if it is not, then $S_k(c, A)$ is not defined).

For regular sequences $S(A)$, we will use the notation $O'(A)$ to denote the omitted set of $S'(A)$. Recall Theorem 1.5:

Theorem 1.5. Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be an independent sequence with character λ . Let ℓ be the minimum adequate integer for $S(A)$, and pick $k \geq \ell$. Let c be such that

$$\lambda \leq c \leq a_{2^k-2^\ell} - \lambda. \quad (5)$$

Then, $S_k(c, A)$ is defined and is a regular Stanley sequence with core $S(A)$.

We also conjecture the following stronger statement.

Conjecture 4.1. Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be a regular sequence with core $\{a'_n\}$, shift index σ , and character λ . Let k be an adequate integer such that for all $0 \leq i < 2^{k-1}$,

$$a_{2^{k-1}-\sigma+i} = a_{2^{k-1}-\sigma} + a'_i.$$

Let ℓ be the minimal adequate integer for $\{a'_n\}$. Let c be such that

$$\lambda \leq c \leq a_{2^k-2^\ell-\sigma} + a'_{2^k} - a_{2^k-\sigma} - \lambda. \quad (6)$$

Then, $S_k(c, A)$ is defined and is a regular Stanley sequence with core $S(A)$.

Example 4.2. Let $\{a_n\} = S(0)$, and $k = 2$. Then, $\ell = 0$ and $\{a'_n\} = \{a_n\}$, because $S(0)$ is independent. Theorem 1.5 implies that $S_2(c, \{0\})$ is defined for all c such that

$$0 \leq c \leq a_3 + a'_4 - a_4 - \lambda = 4 + 9 - 9 - 0 = 4.$$

Picking $c = 3$, we compute $S_2(3, \{0\})$ by taking the highlighted block of $S(0)$, adding 3 to the block, then recomputing the subsequent terms of the sequence.

$$S(0) = 0, 1, \underbrace{3, 4}_{\Gamma_1}, \underbrace{9, 10, 12, 13}_{\Gamma_2}, \underbrace{27, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, 39, 40}_{\Gamma_3}, \underbrace{81, 82, 84, 85, 90, 91, 93, 94, 108, 109, 111, 112, 117, 118, 120, 121}_{\Gamma_4}, \dots$$

This results in the sequence

$$S(0, 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 16) = 0, 1, 3, 4, \underbrace{12, 13, 15, 16}_{\Gamma_2}, \underbrace{33, 34, 36, 37, 42, 43, 45, 46}_{\Gamma_3}, \underbrace{93, 94, 96, 97, 102, 103, 105, 106, 120, 121, 123, 124, 129, 130, 132, 133}_{\Gamma_4}, \dots$$

Note this sequence is dependent, with core $S(0)$. In fact, it is possible to construct $S_2(3, \{0\})$ from $S(0)$ as follows: Add 3 to the block $\{9, 10, 12, 13\}$, then add $2 \cdot 3$ to the next block, add $2^2 \cdot 3$ to the next block, etc.

We now repeat the shifting process on the block $\{33, 34, 36, 37, 42, 43, 45, 46\}$ of the sequence $S_2(3, \{0\})$. According to Conjecture 4.1, we are able to pick any c such that

$$\lambda \leq c \leq 2 \cdot 13 - 16 = 10,$$

where 16 is the preceding element of the sequence $S_2(3, \{0\})$ and 13 is the corresponding element of the core sequence $S(0)$. Picking $c = 10$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& S(0, 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 16, 43, 44, 46, 47, 52, 53, 55, 56) \\
= & 0, 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 16, \underbrace{43, 44, 46, 47, 52, 53, 55, 56}_{\Gamma_3} \\
& \underbrace{113, 114, 116, 117, 122, 123, 125, 126, 140, 141, 143, 144, 149, 150, 152, 153, \dots}_{\Gamma_4}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that this sequence is dependent, with core $S(0)$.

To prove Theorem 1.5, we begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be independent. Pick m adequate, and set $\Lambda_m = \{a_i \mid 0 \leq i < 2^m\}$. Let nonnegative integers d, e be such that $a_{2^m-1} + d \leq e$ (so that $\Lambda_m + d$ and $\Lambda_m + e$ occupy disjoint intervals). Then, $\Lambda_m + d$ and $\Lambda_m + e$ jointly cover*

$$([2e - d, a_{2^m} + 2e - d] \setminus (O(A) + (2e - d))) \cup (O(A) + (a_{2^m} + 2e - d)).$$

Proof. It is obvious that

$$\{2y - x \mid x \in \Lambda_m + d, y \in \Lambda_m + e, y = x + (e - d)\} = (\Lambda_m + (2e - d)). \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, since Λ_m covers

$$[0, a_{2^m}) \setminus (O(A) \cup \Lambda_m)$$

we conclude that

$$\{2y - x \mid x \in \Lambda_m + d, y \in \Lambda_m + e, y > x + (e - d)\} \supseteq ([0, a_{2^m}) \setminus (O(A) \cup \Lambda_m)) + (2e - d) \quad (8)$$

Now, consider some large n . It is evident that $O(A) + a_{2^n}$ is not in $S(A)$ and hence must be covered by it. Pick some element $s \in O(A) + a_{2^n}$ and suppose $2y - x = s$ with $x, y \in S(A)$ and $y > x$. Since $s \in O(A) + a_{2^n}$, $x < a_{2^n}$. Then, since n is large, $y < a_{2^n}$. Because m is adequate, $2a_{2^m-1} - \lambda + 1 = a_{2^m} > a_{2^m-1}$, so $a_{2^m-1} \geq \lambda$. Then, we conclude that

$$s \geq a_{2^n} = 2a_{2^n-1} - \lambda + 1 > 2a_{2^n-1} - a_{2^m-1}. \quad (9)$$

Since $x, y \leq a_{2^n-1}$ and $2y - x = s$, it is simple to conclude from (9) that $x \leq a_{2^m-1}$ and $y \geq a_{2^n-1} - a_{2^m-1} = a_{2^n-2^m}$, implying that $x \in \Lambda_m$ and $y \in \Lambda_m + a_{2^n-2^m}$. This implies that Λ_m and $\Lambda_m + a_{2^n-2^m}$ jointly cover $O(A) + a_{2^n}$. Applying the Cover-shift Lemma tells us that $\Lambda_m + d$ and $\Lambda_m + e$ must jointly cover

$$\begin{aligned}
O(A) + a_{2^n} + 2(e - a_{2^n-2^m}) - d &= O(A) + a_{2^n} - 2(a_{2^n-1} - a_{2^m-1}) + (2e - d) \\
&= O(A) + a_{2^n} - (a_{2^n} + \lambda - 1) + (a_{2^m} + \lambda - 1) + (2e - d) \\
&= O(A) + a_{2^m} + 2e - d.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this result with (7) and (8), we conclude that $\Lambda_m + d$ and $\Lambda_m + e$ must jointly cover

$$([2e - d, a_{2^m} + 2e - d] \setminus (O(A) + (2e - d))) \cup (O(A) + (a_{2^m} + 2e - d)),$$

as desired. $\square$

We now use Lemma 4.3 to prove a stronger version of itself.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $S(A) = \{a_n\}$ be independent with character λ , and let ℓ be the minimal adequate integer for $S(A)$. Pick $k \geq \ell$ and set $\Lambda_k = \{a_i \mid 0 \leq i < 2^k\}$. Let nonnegative integers d, e be such that $a_{2^k-1} + d \leq e$ (so that $\Lambda_k + d$ and $\Lambda_k + e$ occupy disjoint intervals). Then, $\Lambda_k + d$ and $\Lambda_k + e$ jointly cover*

$$[2e - d - a_{2^k-2^\ell} + \lambda, a_{2^k} + 2e - d) \cup (O(A) + (a_{2^k} + 2e - d)).$$

Proof. Let $m < k$ be an adequate integer for $\{a_m\}$, and let $\Lambda_m = \{a_i \mid 0 \leq i < 2^m\}$. By Lemma 4.3,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{2(a_j + e) - (a_i + d) \mid 2^k - 2^m \leq i \leq 2^k - 1, 0 \leq j \leq 2^m - 1\} \\ = & \{2y - x \mid x \in \Lambda_m + a_{2^k-2^m} + d, y \in \Lambda_m + e\} \\ \supseteq & ([2e - a_{2^k-2^m} - d, a_{2^m} + 2e - a_{2^k-2^m} - d) \setminus (O(A) + (2e - a_{2^k-2^m} - d))) \\ & \cup (O(A) + (a_{2^m} + 2e - a_{2^k-2^m} - d)) \\ = & ([2e - a_{2^k-2^m} - d, 2e - a_{2^k-2^{m+1}} - d) \setminus (O(A) + (2e - a_{2^k-2^m} - d))) \\ & \cup (O(A) + (2e - a_{2^k-2^{m+1}} - d)), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where the last step follows from

$$a_{2^k-2^m} - a_{2^m} = a_{2^k-1} - a_{2^m-1} - a_{2^m} = a_{2^k-1} - a_{2^{m+1}-1} = a_{2^k-2^{m+1}}. \quad (11)$$

Hence, the expression given on the right side of (10) is jointly covered by $\Lambda_k + d$ and $\Lambda_k + e$. We take the union of this expression over all possible m ($\ell \leq m \leq k-1$) and observe that it “telescopes,” becoming the expression

$$([2e - a_{2^k-2^\ell} - d, 2e - d) \setminus (O(A) + (2e - a_{2^k-2^\ell} - d))) \cup (O(A) + 2e - d), \quad (12)$$

which must in turn be jointly covered by $\Lambda_k + d$ and $\Lambda_k + e$.

Again applying Lemma 4.3, we see that $\Lambda_k + d$ and $\Lambda_k + e$ must also jointly cover

$$\begin{aligned} & \{2(a_j + e) - (a_i + d) \mid 0 \leq i, j \leq 2^k - 1\} \\ = & \{2y - x \mid x \in \Lambda_k + d, y \in \Lambda_k + e\} \\ \supseteq & ([2e - d, a_{2^k} + 2e - d) \setminus (O(A) + 2e - d)) \cup (O(A) + (a_{2^k} + 2e - d)). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Combining (12) and (13), we see that $\Lambda_k + d$ and $\Lambda_k + e$ must jointly cover

$$\begin{aligned} & ([2e - a_{2^k-2^\ell} - d, a_{2^k} + 2e - d) \setminus (O(A) + (2e - a_{2^k-2^\ell} - d))) \cup (O(A) + (a_{2^k} + 2e - d)) \\ \subseteq & [2e - a_{2^k-2^\ell} - d + \lambda, a_{2^k} + 2e) \cup (O(A) + (a_{2^k} + 2e)), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the last step follows from Lemma 2.13, since every element of $O(A)$ is at most λ . This finishes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Let c be such that (5) is satisfied. Let $S_k(c, A) = \{a_i^*\}$ be our shifted Stanley sequence. For each i , let

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_j &= \{a_i \mid 0 \leq i < 2^j\} \\ \Lambda_j^* &= \{a_i^* \mid 0 \leq i < 2^j\} \\ \Gamma_i &= \{a_i \mid 2^j \leq i < 2^{j+1}\} \\ \Gamma_i^* &= \{a_i^* \mid 2^j \leq i < 2^{j+1}\}.\end{aligned}$$

We claim that $\Gamma_j^* = \Gamma_j + 2^{j-k} \cdot c$ for each $j \geq k$. By construction, we know already that Γ_k^* is of this form. In our proof, we consider the block Γ_{k+1}^* , and then we use induction to prove the result for all $j \geq k+1$.

First, we prove that $S_k(c, A)$ is defined by proving that its nucleating set $A^* = \Lambda_k \cup (\Gamma_k + c)$ is 3-free. Observe that all elements of $\Gamma_k + c$ are at least

$$a_{2^k} + c \geq a_{2^k} + \lambda \geq 2a_{2^{k-1}} + 1$$

and therefore cannot be covered by Λ_k . Hence, A^* is indeed 3-free.

We now consider what is covered by $\Gamma_k + c$ alone. Since Λ_k covers the set $[a_{2^{k-1}} + 1, a_{2^k}) \cup (O(A) + a_{2^k})$, we conclude that $\Gamma_k + c = \Lambda_k + a_{2^k} + c$ must cover the set

$$[a_{2^{k-1}} + a_{2^k} + c + 1, 2a_{2^k} + c) \cup (O(A) + 2a_{2^k} + c) = [a_{2^{k+1}-1} + c + 1, 2a_{2^k} + c) \cup (O(A) + 2a_{2^k} + c). \quad (15)$$

We now apply Lemma 4.4 to Λ_k and $\Gamma_k + c = \Lambda_k + a_{2^k} + c$. This implies that Λ_k and $\Gamma_k + c$ must jointly cover

$$[2a_{2^k} + 2c - a_{2^{k-2}} + \lambda, 3a_{2^k} + 2c) \cup (O(A) + (3a_{2^k} + 2c)). \quad (16)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}2a_{2^k} + 2c - a_{2^{k-2}} + \lambda &\leq 2a_{2^k} + c + (a_{2^{k-2}} - \lambda) - a_{2^{k-2}} + \lambda \\ &= 2a_{2^k} + c.\end{aligned}$$

Now, we can combine (15) and (16) to conclude that A^* covers

$$[a_{2^{k+1}-1} + c + 1, 3a_{2^k} + 2c) \cup (O(A) + (3a_{2^k} + 2c)).$$

We can rewrite

$$3a_{2^k} = 2a_{2^k} + (2a_{2^{k-1}} - \lambda + 1) = 2(a_{2^k} + a_{2^{k-1}}) - \lambda + 1 = 2a_{2^{k+1}-1} - \lambda + 1 = a_{2^{k+1}}.$$

Hence, A^* covers

$$[a_{2^{k+1}-1} + c + 1, a_{2^{k+1}} + 2c) \cup (O(A) + (a_{2^{k+1}} + 2c)). \quad (17)$$

Let Q be the set of the integers that are at least $a_{2^{k+1}} + 2c$ and are covered by A^* . We claim that

$$Q = O(A) + (a_{2^{k+1}} + 2c). \quad (18)$$

From (17), we know that $Q \supseteq O(A) + (a_{2^{k+1}} + 2c)$. We now prove the other direction: $\subseteq$.

Pick some $q \in Q$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that q is covered by $\Gamma_k + c$. Since the largest element of $\Gamma_k + c$ is $a_{2^{k+1}-1} + c$ and the smallest is $a_{2^k} + c$, we know that

$$2a_{2^{k+1}-1} - a_{2^k} + c \geq q \geq a_{2^{k+1}} + 2c = 2a_{2^{k+1}-1} - \lambda + 1 + 2c$$

and therefore that $c \leq \lambda - 1 - a_{2^k}$, an impossibility since $a_{2^k} \geq \lambda$.

We conclude that q is not covered by $\Gamma_k + c$ and therefore must be jointly covered by Λ_k and $\Gamma_k + c$. From the original Stanley sequence $S(A)$, we know that Λ_k and Γ_k jointly cover no integers greater than $a_{2^{k+1}}$, except for those in the set $O(A) + a_{2^{k+1}}$. By the Cover-shift Lemma, Λ_k and $\Gamma_k + c$ must jointly cover no integers greater than $a_{2^{k+1}} + 2c$, except for those in the set $O(A) + a_{2^{k+1}} + 2c$. Therefore $Q \subseteq O(A) + (a_{2^{k+1}} + 2c)$, proving the equation (18).

Recall that we wished to prove that the block Γ_{k+1}^* in $S_k(c, A)$ is equal to $\Gamma_{k+1} + 2c$. This now follows immediately from (17) and (18).

Consider some $j \geq k+1$, and assume towards induction that we have $\Gamma_j^* = \Gamma_j + 2^{j-k} \cdot c$. Assume further that Λ_{j-1}^* and Γ_{j-1}^* jointly cover the set

$$[2a_{2^{j-1}}^* - a_{2^{j-1}-2^\ell} + \lambda, a_{2^j}^*) \cup (O(A) + a_{2^j}^*). \quad (19)$$

The base case of $j = k+1$ follows from (16).

Now, let

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_j^1 &= \{a_i^* \mid 0 \leq i < 2^{j-1}\} \\ \Lambda_j^2 &= \{a_i^* \mid 2^{j-1} \leq i < 2^j\} \\ \Gamma_j^1 &= \{a_i^* \mid 2^j \leq i < 2^j + 2^{j-1}\} \\ \Gamma_j^2 &= \{a_i^* \mid 2^j + 2^{j-1} \leq i < 2^{j+1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

so that $\Lambda_j^* = \Lambda_j^1 \cup \Lambda_j^2$ and $\Gamma_j^* = \Gamma_j^1 \cup \Gamma_j^2$.

Note that $\Lambda_j^2 = \Lambda_{j-1} + a_{2^{j-1}}^*$ and $\Gamma_j^1 = \Lambda_{j-1} + a_{2^j}^*$. Then, applying Lemma 4.4, we conclude that Λ_j^2 and Γ_j^1 jointly cover

$$\begin{aligned} &[2a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}}^* - a_{2^{j-1}-2^\ell} + \lambda, a_{2^{j-1}} + 2a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}}^*) \\ &\cup (O(A) + (a_{2^{j-1}} + 2a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}}^*)) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\supseteq [2a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}}^* - a_{2^{j-1}-2^\ell} + \lambda, a_{2^{j-1}} + 2a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}}^*). \quad (21)$$

Similarly Λ_j^2 and $\Gamma_j^2 = \Gamma_j^2 + a_{2^{j-1}}$ must jointly cover

$$[2a_{2^j}^* + 2a_{2^{j-1}} - a_{2^{j-1}}^* - a_{2^{j-1}-2^\ell} + \lambda, 3a_{2^{j-1}} + 2a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}}^*). \quad (22)$$

By our inductive hypothesis, we know that Λ_{j-1}^* and Γ_{j-1}^* jointly cover (19). Since $\Lambda_j^1 = \Lambda_{j-1}^*$ and $\Gamma_j^1 = \Gamma_{j-1}^* + a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}}^*$, the Cover-shift Lemma implies that Λ_j^1 and Γ_j^1 jointly cover

$$\begin{aligned} &[2a_{2^{j-1}}^* - a_{2^{j-1}-2^\ell} + \lambda + 2(a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}}^*), a_{2^j}^* + 2(a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}}^*)] \\ &\cup (O(A) + (a_{2^j}^* + 2(a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}}^*))) \\ &\supseteq [2a_{2^j}^* - a_{2^{j-1}-2^\ell} + \lambda, 3a_{2^j}^* - 2a_{2^{j-1}}^*). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Similarly, $\Lambda_j^1 = \Lambda_{j-1}^*$ and $\Gamma_j^2 = \Gamma_j^2 + a_{2^{j-1}}$ must jointly cover

$$[2a_{2^j}^* + 2a_{2^{j-1}} - a_{2^{j-1}-2^\ell} + \lambda, 3a_{2^j}^* + 2a_{2^{j-1}} - 2a_{2^{j-1}}^*) \cup (O(A) + (3a_{2^j}^* + 2a_{2^{j-1}} - 2a_{2^{j-1}}^*)). \quad (24)$$

Combining (21), (23), (22), and (24), we conclude that Λ_j^* and Γ_j^* must jointly cover

$$\begin{aligned}
& [2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1}^* - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda, a_{2j-1} + 2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1}^*] \\
\cup & [2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda, 3a_{2j}^* - 2a_{2j-1}^*] \\
\cup & [2a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - a_{2j-1}^* - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda, 3a_{2j-1} + 2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1}^*] \\
\cup & [2a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda, 3a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - 2a_{2j-1}^*] \\
\cup & (O(A) + (3a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - 2a_{2j-1}^*)).
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{2j-1-2^\ell} - \lambda & \geq 2^{j-1-k}(a_{2^{k-2}^\ell} - \lambda) \\
& \geq 2^{j-1-k}c \\
& = a_{2j-1}^* - a_{2j-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$a_{2j-1} + 2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1}^* \geq 2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda$$

and

$$3a_{2j-1} + 2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1}^* \geq 2a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda.$$

These two inequalities allow us to simplify (25) to

$$\begin{aligned}
& [2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1}^* - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda, 3a_{2j}^* - 2a_{2j-1}^*] \\
\cup & [2a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - a_{2j-1}^* - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda, 3a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - 2a_{2j-1}^*] \\
\cup & (O(A) + (3a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - 2a_{2j-1}^*)).
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

We observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1}^* & = (3a_{2j} + 2^{j-k} \cdot c) - (a_{2j-1} + 2^{j-1-k} \cdot c) \\
& \geq 2a_{2j-1} \\
& \geq 2a_{2j-1} - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$3a_{2j}^* - 2a_{2j-1}^* \geq 2a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - a_{2j-1}^* - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda.$$

Then, we can simplify (26) to conclude that Λ_j^* and Γ_j^* jointly cover

$$[2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1}^* - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda, 3a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - 2a_{2j-1}^*] \cup (O(A) + (3a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - 2a_{2j-1}^*)).$$

We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
3a_{2j}^* + 2a_{2j-1} - 2a_{2j-1}^* & = 3(a_{2j} + 2^{j-k}c) - 2^{j-k} \cdot c \\
& = a_{2j+1} - 2^{j+1-k} \cdot c,
\end{aligned}$$

so Λ_j^* and Γ_j^* jointly cover

$$[2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1}^* - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda, a_{2j+1} - 2^{j+1-k} \cdot c] \cup (O(A) + (a_{2j+1} - 2^{j+1-k} \cdot c)). \tag{27}$$

Finally, we observe that $\Gamma_j^* = \Lambda_j + a_{2j}^*$. Since Λ_j covers $[a_{2j-1} + 1, a_{2j})$, we conclude that Γ_j^* must cover

$$[a_{2j}^* + a_{2j-1} + 1, a_{2j}^* + a_{2j}). \quad (28)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2j-1}^* + a_{2j-1-2^\ell} - \lambda &\geq 2^{j-k}(a_{2k-2^\ell} - \lambda) \\ &\geq 2^{j-k}c \\ &= a_{2j}^* - a_{2j}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$a_{2j}^* + a_{2j} \geq 2a_{2j}^* - a_{2j-1}^* - a_{2j-1-2^\ell} + \lambda,$$

so we can combine (28) with (27) to conclude that $\Lambda_j^* \cup \Gamma_j^*$ must cover

$$[a_{2j}^* + a_{2j-1} + 1, a_{2j+1} - 2^{j+1-k} \cdot c) \cup (O(A) + (a_{2j+1} - 2^{j+1-k} \cdot c)).$$

Hence, $\Gamma_{j+1}^* = \Gamma_{j+1} + 2^{j+1-k} \cdot c$, which, together with (27), completes the induction.

Thus, $\Gamma_j^* = \Gamma_j + 2^{j-k} \cdot c$ for each $j \geq k$. This shows that $S_k(c, A)$ is a regular Stanley sequence, with core $S(A)$. $\square$

Corollary 4.5. *For each nonnegative integer λ , there are either no regular Stanley sequences with character λ , or else infinitely many.*

Proof. If any regular sequence has character λ , then its core must be an independent sequence $\{a_n\}$ with character λ . The preceding theorem shows that it is possible to construct infinitely many dependent Stanley sequences with $\{a_n\}$ as their core. $\square$

4.2 Deletions in Stanley sequences

Finally, we consider the matter of *deletions*. Erdős et al. [1] and Moy [3] appear to have assumed that Stanley sequences are *maximal* 3-free sets; however, this is not true. For some dependent Stanley sequences, it is possible to remove one or more elements while preserving the Stanley sequence condition. This claim is made clearer by the next example.

Example 4.6. *We have already noted that the sequence*

$$S(0, 1, 4) = 0, 1, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 31, 32, 34, 35, 40, 41, 43, 44, 89, \dots$$

is dependent, with core $S(0) = 0, 1, 3, 4, 9, \dots$. Removing 11 from $S(0, 1, 4)$ yields the sequence

$$0, 1, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 31, 32, 34, 35, 40, 41, 43, 44, 89, \dots,$$

which may be expressed as $S(0, 1, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 31)$. Furthermore, it is evident that this Stanley sequence is dependent, with core $S(0)$ and shift index $\sigma = 1$, since one element was removed.

Likewise, removing both 31 and 32 from $S(0, 1, 4)$ yields the dependent Stanley sequence

$$S(0, 1, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 34, 35, 40, 41, 43, 44, 89),$$

which has core $S(0)$ and shift index $\sigma = 2$, since two elements were removed.

Remark. It follows from Theorem 1.3 that the shift index σ can be arbitrarily large. If $A = \{0\}$, $B = \{0, 1, 4, 5, 12, 14, 15, 31\}$, and k is sufficiently large, the sequence $S(A \otimes_k B)$ is a dependent sequence satisfying

$$\sigma(A \otimes_k B) = 2^k \cdot \sigma(B) = 2^k.$$

Given a dependent Stanley sequence $S(A)$, we say that an element of $S(A)$ is *deletable* if deleting it yields another (dependent) Stanley sequence. We have as yet been unable to derive a general formulation for which elements of a Stanley sequence are deletable.

Conjecture 4.7. *Every dependent Stanley sequence contains infinitely many deletable elements.*

5 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have rigorously identified and explored the notion of regularity in Stanley sequences and have constructed many new classes of regular sequences. Our research suggests several avenues for further exploration. Most significant, perhaps, among these is the problem of whether all irregular sequences satisfy Type 2 growth. A better upper bound on the asymptotic density of irregular sequences would be welcome. Roth's theorem [5] implies that a_n cannot grow linearly with n . A result by Sanders [6] strengthens this bound slightly to $n \log^{1-o(1)} n$. However, no explicit bound of the form $\Omega(n^{1+\epsilon})$ has been found (see Problem 2 of Erdős et al. [1]). We hypothesize that restating the problem using Fourier analysis could shed light on this and other questions in Stanley sequence theory. As the problem is currently stated, complete classification of the regular Stanley sequences seems to us impracticable, but this may become easier when Stanley sequences are set up in Fourier analytical terms.

We conclude by offering an intriguing conjecture of a different flavor. Given a 3-free set A with elements $a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_k$, define a *completion* of A to be a 3-free set A' with elements $a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_k < \dots < a_m$ such that $S(A')$ is regular. For instance, $\{0, 4, 7\}$ and $\{0, 4, 9\}$ are two different completions of $\{0, 4\}$.

Conjecture 5.1. *Every 3-free set has a completion.*

6 Acknowledgments

This research was performed at the University of Minnesota Duluth REU and was supported by the National Science Foundation (grant number DMS-1062709) and the National Security Agency (grant number H98230-11-1-0224).

I would like to thank Joe Gallian for supervising this research, Ricky Liu for offering many insightful questions and ideas, and all the other students and participants in the Duluth REU for their advice and support.

References

- [1] P. Erdős, V. Lev, G. Rauzy, C. Sándor, and A. Sárköszy. Greedy algorithm, arithmetic progressions, subset sums and divisibility. *Discrete Math.*, 200:119–135, 1999.
- [2] S. Lindhurst. An investigation of several interesting sets of numbers generated by the greedy algorithm, 1990. Senior thesis, Princeton University.

- [3] R. A. Moy. On the growth of the counting function of stanley sequences. *Discrete Math.*, 311:560–562, 2011.
- [4] A. M. Odlyzko and R. P. Stanley. Some curious sequences constructed with the greedy algorithm, 1978. Bell Laboratories internal memorandum.
- [5] K. F. Roth. On certain sets of integers. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 28:104–109, 1953.
- [6] T. Sanders. On roth’s theorem on progressions. *Ann. of Math.*, 174:619–636, 2011.

Appendix: Sequences with small character

We have found independent Stanley sequences $S(A)$ for each possible character λ such that $0 \leq \lambda \leq 76$, with the exception of the values 1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 15. The following table gives examples.

λ	A	λ	A	λ	A
0	{0}	26	{0, 5, 9, 12}	52	{0, 1, 10, 13, 14, 23}
1	None	27	{0, 10, 11, 17}	53	{0, 23, 24, 30}
2	{0, 2}	28	{0, 3, 4, 7, 22, 25}	54	{0, 4, 16, 21, 25}
3	None	29	{0, 3, 5, 8, 21, 24, 26}	55	{0, 3, 28}
4	{0, 2, 5}	30	{0, 6, 15}	56	{0, 5, 9, 17, 24}
5	None found	31	{0, 5, 11, 13, 16}	57	{0, 3, 19, 22, 29}
6	{0, 3}	32	{0, 6, 8, 15}	58	{0, 1, 3, 4, 29}
7	{0, 1, 7}	33	{0, 3, 7, 10, 21, 24, 28, 30}	59	{0, 3, 21, 30}
8	{0, 3, 5}	34	{0, 8, 17}	60	{0, 7, 19, 27}
9	None found	35	{0, 9, 10, 13, 19, 22}	61	{0, 5, 13, 18, 24, 28}
10	{0, 1, 4, 6, 10}	36	{0, 18}	62	{0, 8, 12, 20, 27}
11	None found	37	{0, 1, 19}	63	{0, 4, 9, 13, 30, 33}
12	{0, 6}	38	{0, 3, 11, 18}	64	{0, 3, 9, 12, 31, 34}
13	{0, 2, 7, 9, 13}	39	{0, 11, 15, 16, 20, 26, 28}	65	{0, 5, 17, 22, 28, 30, 33}
14	{0, 3, 8}	40	{0, 2, 7, 15, 16, 20}	66	{0, 10, 22, 27, 30}
15	None found	41	{0, 3, 11, 14, 21, 24, 30}	67	{0, 11, 23, 24, 28, 34}
16	{0, 4, 7}	42	{0, 9, 12, 13, 21}	68	{0, 3, 11, 12, 23, 27, 30}
17	{0, 4, 5, 9, 15, 17}	43	{0, 1, 9, 10, 25}	69	{0, 3, 4, 19, 22, 23, 28}
18	{0, 9}	44	{0, 14, 18, 21}	70	{0, 7, 9, 19, 27, 34}
19	{0, 3, 10}	45	{0, 1, 16, 17, 19, 20, 29}	71	{0, 8, 9, 17, 30, 33, 38}
20	{0, 1, 10}	46	{0, 1, 4, 12, 19}	72	{0, 13, 25, 27, 33}
21	{0, 1, 3, 4, 21}	47	{0, 20, 21, 27}	73	{0, 4, 5, 9, 15, 17, 20, 28}
22	{0, 8, 9, 14}	48	{0, 1, 12, 13, 21}	74	{0, 14, 17, 26, 27, 33}
23	{0, 7, 9, 10, 16}	49	{0, 9, 25}	75	{0, 4, 13, 17, 25, 29, 38}
24	{0, 9, 12}	50	{0, 2, 12, 14, 21}	76	{0, 1, 7, 8, 21, 28}
25	{0, 2, 3, 5, 23, 25}	51	{0, 5, 13, 16, 18, 24, 28}		